DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 622 EA 020 281

AUTHOR Krysinski, Patricia R.
TITLE Educational Administrative Inservice Training: An Outline of a Grounded Theory.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; *Educational Administration; High Schools; *Inservice Education; *Management Development; *Organizational Theories
IDENTIFIERS Washington

ABSTRACT

This outline of a grounded theory of educational administrative inservice training demonstrates the organizational characteristics and outcomes for participants as the results of a qualitative study. Focusing on high school principals, this study addresses two questions: What are the organizational characteristics of inservice training for school administrators? and What combinations of these characteristics are related to certain outcomes? For purposes of this study, a grounded theory is a statement about kinds of data that will occur under particular circumstances. Fifteen high school principals were selected on the basis of five criteria. Retrospective interviews, document collection from respondents and from independent sources, and on-site observations make up the field procedures. The conclusions, based on the results, are stated as a series of integrated definitions and propositions that detail an outline of the grounded theory. Recommendations for further research are suggested. Forty-nine references are appended. (LMS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298622

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE INSERVICE TRAINING:

AN OUTLINE OF A GROUNDED THEORY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Krysinski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Patricia R. Krysinski

Director, Project LEAD Consortium

Association of Washington School Principals

Washington Association of School Administrators

This paper was prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 5-9, 1988, New Orleans, Louisiana.

EA 020 281

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge and thank Professor Walter H. Gmelch, Chair, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Washington State University, for his invaluable assistance and support throughout the entire project. I also wish to thank Professor Donald B. Reed, Acting Chair, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Washington State University, for his continued encouragement and critical review of the various drafts of the manuscript. I also wish to acknowledge and thank Professor Robert J. Harder, Associate Dean for Instruction, College of Education, Washington State University, for his careful reading of the manuscript and his useful comments and suggestions.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge Dr. Howard Coble, Executive Director of the Washington Association of School Administrators and Dr. John Fotheringham, Associate Executive Director of the Washington Association of School Administrators for their interest and commitment to educational administrative inservice education. Furthermore, I wish to acknowledge their support for this project by providing resources necessary for production of the manuscript. Finally, I wish to acknowledge and thank the school administrators, who remain unidentified, for providing the data for the study.

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE INSERVICE TRAINING: AN OUTLINE OF A GROUNDED THEORY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to develop an outline of a grounded theory relating organizational characteristics of educational administrative inservice training and outcomes for participants. This is a report of a qualitative study which focuses on educational administrative inservice training for high school principals. Specifically, this study addresses two questions, (1) What are the organizational characteristics of inservice training for school administrators? and (2) What combinations of organizational characteristics are related to certain outcomes for participants?

Many aspects of inservice training for school administrators have been investigated. The problems associated with administrative inservice training have been described in literature (Gmelch, Rose, & Erickson, 1976; Daresh & LaPlant, 1985; Burello & Orbaugh, 1982; Miles & Biggs, 1979); and recommendations for improving administrative inservice training have been given (Lutz & Ferrante, 1972; Olivero, 1982; Gmelch, et al., 1976; Higley, 1974; Stanton, 1980; Burello & Orbaugh, 1982; Somerville, 1982). Descriptions of models of administrative

inservice training have been studied and recommended (Sange, 1982; Biles, 1979; Kipp, Thayer & Olivero, 1985; Caldwell, 1979; Silver & Moyle, 1984; Donaldson, 1982; Huddle, 1982; Nudson & DeVries, 1979; Barth, 1984; Wise, 1981; DeLacy & Rogel, 1981; Pitner, 1982; Orlich, 1985; Scott-McDonald & Howe, 1986). Studies of assessment centers as methods for assessing individuals as well as determining inservice training needs have been reported (Olivas, 1980; Hersey, 1982; Schmitt, Merritt, & Fitzgerald, 1982; DeMont & Hughes, 1984). In spite of the relative abundance of publications about administrative inservice training, a comprehensive theory of inservice training remains to be developed (Daresh & LaPlant, 1985). In addition, a sparsity of sources exist that describe the organizational characteristics of administrative inservice training and the impact to participants.

Orientation of the Study

In order to fulfill the purposes of this study and the need for a comprehensive theory of administrative inservice training an appropriate methodology was selected. A qualitative research methodology oriented to developing a grounded substantive theory was used in the present study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Glaser and Strauss state: "By substantive theory, we mean that

developed for a substantive or empirical area of . . . inquiry, such as patient care, race relations, professional education, delinquency, or research organization" (p. 32). In this study, the substantive area of inquiry is inservice training of public high school principals.

A grounded theory is a "statement about the empirical world. It is composed of interrelated hypotheses about particular kinds of data that will occur under particular circumstances" (Lutz & Iannaccone, 1969). Similarly, Glaser and Strauss argue that a grounded theory is a theory that is systematically and inductively ". . . discovered by examination of the data . . ." (p. 3), rather than from deductive processes. Glaser and Strauss state: "Generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from the data, but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of research. Generating a theory involves a process of research" (p. 6). Glaser and Strauss argue persuasively that qualitative methods are the most appropriate for discovering grounded theory.

This study is oriented toward theory construction rather than hypothesis testing. In order to generate a theory, three activities occur. First, conceptual categories and their properties are identified. Next, generalized relations among the categories and their properties are ascertained and presented as propositions. Finally, the interrelationships among the

propositions are explicated and form the grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Theoretical Orientation of the Study

In qualitative research methodology oriented to developing a substantive theory, "the researcher is free to think of any or all pertinent theories and assumptions about subject matter and thereby free himself from substantive orthodoxy" (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973). But what the researcher does need is a theoretical framework "for gaining entry into subject matter, and for raising relevant questions . . ." (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973). For the purpose of guiding the study the following analytical framework was used.

The impact of organizations on the conduct of individuals or classes of organizational participants can be understood in terms of three organizational elements considered individually and/or in combination. These elements are (1) organizational structure, (2) organizational goals, and (3) organizational process. Organizational elements do not exist in isolation. Hence, organizational goals, structure, and process do not act independently, but are interrelated and condition the outcomes for participants.

Structure

Organizational structure refers to "patterned or regularized aspects of relationships existing among participants in an organization" (Scott, 1981, p. 13). Structure can be conceptualized on a continuum of related characteristics. Structure can be described by formal and informal arrangements (Scott, 1981; March & Simon, 1958). Formal patterns are delineated by Barnard (1939) as a "system of consciously coordinated activities" (1968, p. 81). Formal arrangements are planned; pre-established rules govern the relationships among participants. Informal aspects of structure emerge when patterns and interactions are under the control of individual participants rather than planned in advance by others. Iannaconne (1964) states, ". . . the concept of informal organization for the complex network of interpersonal relations within the organization which meets the individual's needs for satisfying human relations but which are not taken into consideration by the formal organization" (p. 225).

Structure further may be described in terms of the characteristics of participants, that is, the homogeneity and heterogeneity of participants (March & Olsen, 1976). Homogeneous classes of participants are from similar positions in an organizational hierarchy and share a broad set of common beliefs.

Heterogeneous classes of participants are from different positions within an organizational hierarchy and have differing sets of beliefs and values.

Organizational structure can be described by a continuum of two sets of characteristics, (1) formal and informal and (2) homogeneous and heterogeneous. Organizational structure can be conceptualized in four combinations, including formal homogeneous structures, informal homogeneous, formal heterogeneous, and informal heterogeneous structures.

Goals

As noted briefly, goals are "conceptions of desired ends -- the conditions participants attempt to effect through their performance of task activities" (Scott, 1981, p. 16). Simon (1987) argues that goals provide criteria to generate and to select among various courses of action. In their argument for decision making, March and Olsen (1976) suggest a distinction between pre-existing goals and post facto goal discovery. They argue "that a description that assumes goals come first and action comes later is frequently radically wrong" (p. 72).

Processes

Perrow (1965) refers to organizational process as technology. With respect to organizations, technology is the "techniques or complex of techniques employed to alter 'material' (human/non-human), mental, physical in an anticipated manner" (p. 915). The necessary conditions for a technology include five specifications of his definition: (a) knowledge of non-random cause/effect relationship, (b) systems of feedback so the consequences of actions are measured objectively, (c) repeated demonstrations of an act, (d) proportion of successes can be estimated, and (e) the techniques can be communicated sufficiently so that most persons can be expected to master the techniques (Perrow, 1965). Perrow does not limit the definition to tools and hardware, but notes that technology springs from " a knowledge of raw materials" (p. 916).

Interdependency of Structure, Goals, and Processes

Perrow (1965) suggests that structure, goals, and processes are interdependent. Perrow states:

> Belief systems and values which underlie purposes are interdependent with technology or organizational process. Some values encourage a search for new

> techniques. Techniques can modify values by demonstrating the potentialities of the material that is to be transformed. Technology in turn influences structure, the arrangements necessary to implement goals. Tasks are embedded in structure. Structure, too, can be a relatively autonomous element in organizations just as belief systems and technology are relatively autonomous. From one point of view, structure is part of technology. . . . But structure can operate in an autonomous fashion, resisting or bringing about change in technology and goals (p. 914).

Perrow (1965) further states that structure, goals, and technology are "interdependent rather than strictly independent or dependent upon one another; and at any one time, one may have the power to influence the others" (p. 914). That is to say, the organizational components operate in consort, each influencing the other. Although these are interdependent organizational characteristics, they are nonetheless useful for analytic purpose to describe organizations.

Limitations of the Study

Consistent with the methods associated with qualitative

research, the study was limited to a relatively small number of high school principals in the state of Washington. While organizational characteristics of administrative inservice training appeared related to outcomes for participants, the grounded theory that emerged from the study should be generalized to other classes of participants with care. The results of this study, however, can serve as a strategy for advancing the generation of theory to an area where no grounded theoretical literature exists.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study can be understood in terms of theoretical, substantive, and practical contributions. At a theoretical level, the outline of a theory contributes to the understanding of how professionals learn beyond their formal training level. At a substantive level, the theory suggests how principals develop the know-how and skills commensurate with their job responsibilities. At a practical level, the study provides guidance for organizing inservice training for school administrators and other professionals.

Literature Review

The theoretical construct used in this literature review tends to be useful in capturing most, if not all, of the relevant aspects of administrative inservice training. Using the organizational components of structure, purpose, process, and interdependency among the components to impact participants, insight is gained into the nature of administrative inservice training. Literature about educational administrative inservice training suggests that structure exists.

Formal structures emerge from the establishment of planned program formats that set the pattern of interactions among participants. (Lambert, 1986; Kipp et al., 1986; Scott-McDonald & Howe, 1986; Lutz & Ferrante, 1972; Huddle, 1982; Wise, 1981; Orlich, 1980; Donaldson, 1982; DeLacy & Rogel, 1981; Biles, 1979; Garberina; 1980).

To a lesser extent, informal patterns exist. Informal structures emerge from unplanned situations where participants are free to determine interactions (Donaldson, 1982; Huddle, 1982; Scott-McDonald & Howe, 1986).

Administrative inservice training programs are scheduled for similar classes of participants. That is, individuals from the same job classification, such as principal, attend inservice activities (Erlandson, Henejosa, & McDonald, 1986; Barth, 1984).

This structure is homogeneous.

Also, inservice training programs are designed for people of different job classifications, such as teachers, principals, business leaders, and school board members (Sange, 1982; Nudson & DeVries, 1979; Scott-McDonald & Howe, 1986). This structure is heterogeneous.

Goals of administrative inservice training can be conceptualized on two levels. Operative level goals can be inferred from the content of the program. That is to say, the content is specific and relates to subject matter the participants are expected to learn. The content of administrative inservice training appear to fall somewhat equally along two strands, (1) self-improvement, and (2) improvement of others (Donaldson, 1982; Biles, 1979; Garberina, 1980; Allen, Pellicer, & Boardman, 1984; Scott-McDonald & Howe, 1986). Where content is not specified, implicit assumptions exist that the system level goal is to improve administrator performance.

In most instances, the content of administrative inservice training is determined in advance (Orlich, 1985; Caldwell, 1979; DeMont & Hughes, 1984; Olivas, 1980). To a lesser extent, the content emerges from the concerns and needs that individual participants bring to the setting (Barth, 1984; Scott-McDonald & Howe, 1986).

Processes in administrative inservice training can be

conceptualized as instructional procedures (Perrow, 1965; Daft, 1983; Jackson, 1986). Much of the literature refers to instructional procedures which have a direct character. That is, information is disseminated to learners using pedagogical processes (Donaldson, 1982; Wise, 1981; Sange, 1982; DeLacy & Rogel, 1981; Gmelch et al., 1976; Caldwell, 1979; Daresh & LaPlant, 1985). To a lesser extent, the literature suggests that processes are less direct. Conversing and discussing are the techniques utilized (Higley, 1974; Donaldson, 1982; Biles, 1979; Barth, 1984; Scott-McDonald & Howe, 1986).

The interdependency among organizational components exists in a limited way. By inferring from descriptions of inservice training for school administrators, the argument can be made for the existence of an interdependency. There is some suggestion from literature that goals are linked to structure (Orlich, 1985; Olivero & Armistead, 1981). Also, the literature suggest an interdependency of structure, goals, and processes (Scott-McDonald & Howe, 1986; Pitner, 1982; Daresh, 1987). The impact to participants, if noted, is through outcomes. Outcomes are judged against operative and system level goals (Daresh, 1987; Orlich, 1985; Olivero & Armistead, 1981).

Notwithstanding the usefulness of the theoretical framework to capture the essence of administrative inservice training, some pieces are missing. That is to say, although there is some

semblance of order, much is missing. Some descriptions outline structure and content, but omit outcomes. Some descriptions note outcomes that are note related to goals, structure, or process. Contrariwise, some descriptions outline structure, purpose, and process, but omit outcomes.

By reviewing the literature from the theoretical framework, understanding is gained in a number of areas. Some areas are not well understood. Accordingly, what is needed are both specific and holistic views of administrative inservice training. This need gives credence to a study which explicitly justifies the analysis.

Field Procedures

Considering the purpose of the study, which is to develop a grounded substantive theory for administrative inservice training and recognizing from the literature review that no grounded theory of inservice training exists, it was decided that an efficient and economical procedure appropriate to the level of theory development should be employed. In the area of inquiry, administrative inservice training, the emphasis of the theory development was not on fine detail, but on the discovery of broad patterns of interrelationships among categories of organizational characteristics. Hence, non-participant field study procedures

were utilized (Douglas, 1976).

As noted earlier, non-participant field studies emphasize in depth semi-structured interviews and discussions aided by a checklist of questions (Douglas, 1976). For the purposes of this study, retrospective interviews were selected as part of the research procedure. To address the problems of validity resulting from the selection of retrospective interviews, document collection from respondents and from independent sources occurred. Furthermore, informal on-site observations and discussions with persons associated with the field of inquiry, administrative inservice training, occurred to substantiate information received from respondents. Also, personal experiences of the investigator were used to assess the consistency and validity of the field data (Douglas, 1976).

Sampling Procedures

Consistent with the recommendations of Glaser and Strauss (1967), the selection of informants for inclusion in the study was guided by theoretical sampling. The selection of typical high school principals met five criteria. (1) Informants selected must be in a position of principal of a public comprehensive secondary school that included grades 9-12. Principals of schools that included grades K-6 as well as

principals of non-comprehensive high schools, such as vocational skills centers and alternative high schools were excluded. In addition, principals of private and parochial schools were eliminated from consideration. (2) Principals must be in positions that are directly supervised by a district level administrator, such as a superintendent or assistant superintendent. That is to say, the principal must be a part of a larger educational administrative unit, such as a district or an educational service district. (3) The principal must directly supervise teachers and have managerial responsibilities for activities and programs within the educational system of employment. (4) The principal must not have teaching responsibilities. And, (5) the principal must not hold an official central office position, such as assistant superintendent, director of personnel, or director of curriculum.

In the study reported here, an informant, an experienced high school principal who seemed to be a typical representative of high school principals, was selected as the first informant for data collection. Through analysis of the interview data and by employing the notion associated with comparative method, two additional seemingly typical high school principals were selected for inclusion in the informant sample. During the course of the study, sixteen high school principals were selected for inclusion by employing techniques of theoretical sampling.

In addition to the five criteria placed on the selection of principals as participants, a practical limitation was imposed. Consistent with the recommendations of Lincoln and Guba (1985), the number of principals to be included in the sample was determined to be a minimum of fifteen. Lincoln and Guba (1985) state, "it is usual to find that a dozen or so interviews . . . will exhaust most available information" (p. 235). A judgement was made that a minimum of 15 carefully selected principals for in depth interviews would provide sufficient data for the initial development of grounded theory. Also, it was judged that a single researcher within a three month period available for data collection would have time and resources available for the identification, selection, and interviewing of principals who would be geographically separated in the state of Washington.

Selection of Informants

Selection of informants for the study followed the recommendations of Glaser and Strauss (1967) for theoretical sampling "whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes . . . data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them . . ." (p. 45). Four stages can be identified in the selection of participants for this study, (a) initial selection, (b) literature directed selection, (c)

selection for contrast and comparison, and (d) final selection based on data saturation.

Selection of the first participant was guided by the 4 limitations outlined previously. A principal of a public comprehensive secondary school containing grades 9-12, who is supervised by a superintendent and has supervisory and managerial responsibilities for the high school was selected. An initial set of interview questions oriented to the theoretical framework guided the semi-structured interview. Interview data were coded and analyzed. Based on the analysis of data and review of the interview questions, minor alterations and amplification in the questioning strategy occurred.

A decision was made to interview high school principals who were employed in school districts that were reputed to have administrative inservice activities. Hence, a second group of two respondents was selected. Each respondent met the criteria for sample selection. Following the interviews, data were coded and analyzed. By comparing and contrasting the data from the first selections, a third set of respondents were identified. Differences among the responses from principals of schools located in rural areas and from principals near urban areas indicated that more principals from rural and urban areas needed to be included in the sample. For example, a rural high school principal gave several examples of teacher inservice and needed

greater prompting in applying the concept of inservice training for personnel other than teachers. On the other hand, principals of schools in urban areas mentioned numerous examples of administrative inservice training without alluding to a single example of teacher inservice training.

Consistent with the recommendations of Glaser and Strauss (1967) in the constant-comparative method of data analysis, a third set of respondents were identified. Additional criteria were established and entailed gender, location of school, and experience as a high school principal. Accordingly, twelve high school principals from remote and rural areas of the state as well as high school principals from or near urban centers were chosen. Correspondingly, each of these classes of participants were further delineated by gender and experience. Following the recommendations of Glaser and Strauss, (1967), the third class of respondents selected "had 'enough features in common' with other groups. To be excluded, (they) must show a 'fundamental difference' from others" (p. 50). Each of the respondents in the third selection provided sufficient similarities to yield comparable content.

The final elimination of participants from the sample occurred at the data saturation (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). By simultaneously coding and analyzing data, it had been determined that gender differences were not providing sufficient contrast of

information. Accordingly, when one female respondent became ill and could not participate, she was replaced by a male high school principal from a similar size school and similar location. The information provided by respondents was approaching redundancy. The sample approached the recommended number of a "dozen or so interviews" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). So, when a second participant failed to participate or reschedule the appointment, the participant was eliminated from the sample and not included. Hence, data collected through informant interviews ceased.

The final sample included 15 principals from comprehensive high schools in Washington state. Four females and 11 males composed the sample. Six principals from rural schools of varying size and geographic location were included. Nine principals from comprehensive high schools in or near urban centers were part of the sample. Six principals were employed by schools located in suburban areas; three principals were employed by schools in urban areas. The experience level of the principals ranged varied from 1 to 20 years. Seven principals had five or less years of experience as a high school principal; five had 6-10 years experience; and three had 11-20 years experience as a high school principal. Table 1 displays the final sample of high school principals from the state of Washington.

Table 1

Sample of High School Principals in the State of Washington

Name	Gender		Experience			Location of School		
	Male	Female	0-5	6-10	11-20	Rural	Suburban	Urban
Mr. C.	x		x			x		
Mr. R.	x			x			x	
Mr. B.	x				x		x	
Mr. T.	x		x					x
Ms. S.		x	x					x
Ms. O.		x	x			x		
Ms. K.		x		x			x	
Ms. I.		x	x				x	
Mr. WV.	x				x		x	
Mr. W.	x				x	x		
Mr. G.	x			x				x
Mr. SC.	x		x				x	
Mr. M.	x			x		x		
Mr. SN.	x			x		x		
Mr. L.	x		x			x		
Total	11	4	7	5	3	6	6	3

Procedures Utilized for Data Analysis

The overall purpose of this study is to develop an outline of a grounded theory. As noted earlier, qualitative research methods are appropriate for substantive theory development (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Qualitative research methods rely on systematically generating hypotheses worked out in reaction to the data. That is to say, by using inductive processes, key concepts and properties are noted, conclusions are inferred, and generalizations are made relative to specific data.

Consistent with the analytic processes appropriate for qualitative research procedures, the analysis approaches the data inductively. The data (1) were reviewed by coding transcripts for key properties and concepts, (2) categorized by using index cards, and (3) organized into data retrieval charts (Eggen, Kauchak, & Harder, 1979). Data retrieval charts were used to infer relationships among concepts and for drawing generalizations about the data. Consistent with data analysis employing inductive logic, frequencies of various properties were used to estimate occurrences in the larger population.

The analysis of data began by reviewing transcriptions of interviews. By way of the initial review of transcripts, a commonality among the informant responses was identified. All informants described specific incidents of inservice training for

school administrators. The incidents became the bases of the analysis. The descriptions of incidents given by informants had similar patterns, yet descriptions varied by extensiveness of detail. These descriptions formed the basis for comparing similarities and differences, inferring concepts and developing generalizations related to administrative inservice training.

The descriptions of inservice training incidents were reviewed further for information related to key concepts. The initial key concepts were process, goals, effectiveness, context, and structure. These key concepts were utilized in developing the interview questions. The review of descriptions of incidents occurred by coding the informant responses by key concept categories. In addition, similarities and differences among responses were coded. For example, interview data were reviewed by identifying words and phrases related to processes of inservice training. That is to say, the responses to questions were reviewed for key ideas that directly or indirectly addressed the instructional procedures and activities of the inservice training incidents. As mentioned before, concepts are "systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 3). Accordingly, during the course of the first phase of analysis, concepts which had not been previously considered, but reported by respondents, were coded, and in some instances, labeled as

miscellaneous.

The coded data from the transcripts were recorded on index cards. Information on each index card consisted of an informant identification number, such as "01," an identification number of the inservice training incident, such as "101," and a key concept identifier, such as "process." Informant number 01 who told about the activities of an inservice training incident number 101 had an index card labeled 01-101-Process. Also listed on the index card were quotations from the interview transcriptions that related to processes of inservice training.

Approximately 373 index cards were used in the first phase of the data analysis. The first informant (01) gave data related to six incidents of inservice training, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106. Set 01-101 of the index cards had a total of nine cards. On each of the 9 index cards were written statements taken from the coded transcripts. The use of index cards permitted shuffling of cards, reorganizing categories, observing similarities and differences, and creating new categories while maintaining a reference system to a specific informant and a particular incident. Ultimately, the entire deck of 373 cards could be viewed holistically and independently by categories to draw inferences about relationships among data.

The analysis by way of coding transcripts and developing index cards provided an efficient procedure for categorizing data

and illuminating the similarities and differences among the data. However, a number of ideas evident in the data were incongruent with the key concept categories. Also, some data could be placed in more than one key concept category. Hence, the initially selected categories were re-examined. Through additional study of the data, new key concept categories were created to incorporate the data. Likewise, the theoretical concepts underpinning the categories were re-examined in light of the data.

Data retrieval charts (Eggen, et al., 1979) were utilized in the third phase of data analysis. Data retrieval charts are mechanisms for recording properties and relationships among data. Data retrieval charts provide a procedure for inductively reviewing information from which inferences are drawn and concepts formed (Eggen, et al., 1979). Twelve data retrieval charts were developed, each representing different approaches to categorizing the data. Some "old" and some "new" categories were developed for use in the data retrieval charts. That is to say, a variety of key concepts were used for categories on the retrieval charts. One data retrieval chart organized the informant responses by verbs used by informants to describe the activities associated with instructional procedures. Another data retrieval chart organized the informant responses by characteristics of decision making (March & Olsen, 1976). A

third data retrieval chart organized the informant responses by structural categories related to horizontal and vertical linkage patterns (Daft, 1983). Summary notes representing inferences and generalization of the data from the data retrieval charts were made. Approximately sixty pages of summary notes resulted from this phase of the analysis.

Also utilized in the analysis were tally sheets for determining the frequency of examples falling into categories. Consistent with inductive logic, the actual frequencies of various properties were useful in drawing conclusions and generalizations from specific data. It also should be noted that the use of frequency of occurrences can be estimates of occurrences in the general population. These frequencies have been used in the tradition of Becker (1952).

The theory that emerges from this approach to the data analysis captures the relevant data provided by informants. Due to data saturation in categories, there are substantial verifications. That is to say, one thing did not make it a case.

An Outline of a Grounded Theory for Educational Administrative Inservice Training

In the presentation of the grounded theory of inservice training, the theory will be presented in such a way that it can

include inservice training activities beyond those designed for and experienced by high school principals. This is to say, the grounded theory will be presented in a more general form.

Educational administrative inservice training is distinguished from preservice and service experiences by occurring after appointment to an administrative position. Educational administrative inservice training is not private learning or learning from experiences while serving in official capacities. Educational administrative inservice training is interactive. Inservice training takes place when administrators interact with other people and connect solutions and problems related to job performance.

Educational administrative inservice training can be conceptualized along two dimensions of structure, (1) relationships and (2) accessibility. The two dimensions can be described further by (1) informal to formal relationships and (2) public to private access, respectively. Inservice training with structures characterized by formal relationships have schedules, and agendas direct the interaction among participants according to pre-established patterns. Inservice training that is characterized by informal relationships exist spontaneously and without predetermined patterns of interaction; interactions are personal, approximating collegial interactions.

In addition to having structure characterized by

relationships, inservice training can be viewed in terms of accessibility. Accessibility can be described in terms of public and private access. Some inservice training activities are open to all professionals, including teachers, counselors, school board members, businessmen, and administrators. Access is public. On the other hand, some inservice training events are private and involve educational administrators to the exclusion of teachers. And some inservice training activities are accessible to a specific class of administrators, for example, principals or superintendents. Structures are private in the sense that only a particular class of professionals participate.

The conceptualization of arranging inservice training in two independent dimensions based on relationships and accessibility is derived also from the arrangement and focus of the subject matter. The subject matter in inservice training that is characterized by formal relationships is arranged by solutions; whereas, the subject matter in inservice training that is characterized by informal relationships is arranged by problems. Here the terms solutions and problems refer to the arrangement of content of inservice training. That is to say, some content is arranged to provide solutions to predetermined administrative problems. Contrariwise, some content of inservice training is arranged around administrative problems for which solutions are not predetermined.

The subject matter of inservice training that is characterized by public access focuses on managing "others" and improving oneself. However, inservice training with private access focuses on improving "self."

Delivery processes which are employed at inservice training are related to structure. When delivery processes are characterized by delivery from experts to learners, formal relationship structures are present, in both public and private access structures. When delivery processes are with participants, informal relationships are present, in both public and private access structures.

The success of educational administrative inservice training relies on the joining of solutions and problems through interacting with others. Delivery processes are the connectors for finding solutions for problems. Successful administrative inservice training results when problems and solutions are joined such that knowledge is gained, and acquired knowledge is implemented in schools. Successful administrative inservice training occurs in structures characterized by both formal and informal relationships. Successful administrative inservice training occurs more often in structures designated with private access than in structures characterized by public access.

In addition to the subject matter, delivery processes, and success of inservice training activities that are characteristic

of two dimensions of structure, the demographic information regarding participants also provides distinguishing attributes of inservice training. Men and women participate in inservice training characterized by all the categories of structure. One distinguishing characteristic of inservice training is the location of school. Inservice training activities characterized by formal relationships, with both public and private access, exhibit the presence of both metropolitan and rural administrators. However, inservice training activities with informal relationships, with both public and private access, are characterized by administrators from schools located in metropolitan areas.

Experienced and inexperienced administrators are part of inservice training activities that exhibit formal and informal relationships. Inexperienced administrators are present in inservice training with public access. When only experienced administrators are present, the structure of inservice training moves toward an informal structure. Table 26 outlines the salient aspect of the outline of the grounded theory.

Definitions and Summary Propositions

A grounded theory can be presented in a narrative form. This has been done in the previous section. Additionally,

Table 26

An Outline of a Grounded Theory for Educational Administrative Inservice Training Characterized by Structure

ACCESSIBILITY	Relationship: Formal	Relationship: Informal
Public	Arranged by solutions. Focus on managing others. From experts to learners. Somewhat successful. Metropolitan, rural, inexperienced administrators.	Arranged by problems. Focus on self. With participants. Highly successful. Metropolitan, experienced, inexperienced administrators.
Private	Arranged by solutions and by problems. Focus on self. From experts to learners. With participants. Moderately successful. Metropolitan, rural, inexperienced, experienced administrators.	Arranged by problems. Focus on self. With participants. Highly successful. Metropolitan, experienced administrators.

grounded theory can be formalized as a set of integrated definitions and propositions. In this section, summary definitions and propositions detail the outline of a grounded theory for educational administrative inservice training previously discussed.

Educational Administrative Inservice Training

Definition #1. Educational administrative inservice training occurs when school administrators interact with other people and connect solutions and problems related to job performance.

Structures of Inservice Training

Definition #2. The structure of educational administrative inservice training is the pattern of interactions among participants.

Proposition #1. The structure of inservice training for school administrators can be characterized in terms of relationships and accessibility.

Proposition #1.1. Relationships in inservice training are either formal or informal.

Definition #3. The structure of inservice training is

characterized by formal relationships when schedules are established and agendas direct the interaction among participants according to pre-established patterns.

Definition #4. The structure of inservice training is characterized by informal relationships when schedules and agendas are absent and if participants determine patterns of interaction.

Proposition #1.2. Accessibility of inservice training is either public or private.

Definition #5. The structure of inservice training is characterized by public access when any professional, such as teachers, counselors, school board members, businessmen, and school administrators, are participants.

Definition #6. The structure of inservice training is characterized by private access when only a specific class of professionals, such as school administrators, are participants.

Subject Matter of Inservice Training

Definition #7. The subject matter of inservice training is the content of the training activities.

Proposition #2. The subject matter of inservice training is either arranged by problems and/or by solutions.

Proposition #2.1. If the subject matter is arranged by

solutions, then the focus is on managing others or improving self.

Proposition #2.2. If the subject matter is arranged by problems, then the focus is on self.

Proposition #2.3. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships, then inservice training is arranged by solutions or arranged by solutions and problems.

Proposition #2.4. If the structure is characterized by informal structure, then inservice training is arranged by problems.

Proposition #2.5. If the structure is characterized by public access, then inservice training is arranged by solutions or by problems.

Proposition #2.6. If the structure is characterized by private access, then inservice training is arranged by solutions and problems or by problems.

Proposition #2.7. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships and public access, then the subject matter is arranged by solutions and focuses on managing others.

Proposition #2.8. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships and private access, then the subject matter is arranged by solutions or by problems and focuses on self.

Proposition #2.9. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships and public access, then the subject matter

is arranged by problems and focuses on self.

Proposition #2.10. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships and private access, then the subject matter is arranged by problems and focuses on self.

Delivery Processes of Inservice Training

Definition #8. Delivery processes in inservice training are the teaching techniques employed to connect solutions and problems.

Proposition #3. The delivery processes of inservice training are characterized either by delivery of information from experts to learners or delivery with participants.

Proposition #3.1. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships, then the delivery processes are from experts to learners or with participants.

Proposition #3.2. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships, then the delivery processes are with participants.

Proposition #3.3. If the structure is characterized by public access, then the delivery processes are from experts to learners or with participants.

Proposition #3.4. If the structure is characterized by private access, then the delivery processes are from experts to

learners or with participants.

Proposition #3.5. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships and public access, then the delivery processes are from experts to learners.

Proposition #3.6. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships and private access, then delivery processes are from experts to learners and with participants.

Proposition #3.7. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships and public access, then delivery processes are with participants.

Proposition #3.8. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships and private access, then delivery processes are with participants.

Successful Inservice Training

Definition #9. The success of inservice training is judged by participants in knowledge gained and acquired knowledge implemented in schools.

Proposition #4. Inservice training can be judged successful or unsuccessful.

Proposition #5. Inservice training is judged successful by participants when knowledge is acquired and acquired knowledge is implemented in schools.

Proposition #6. Inservice training is judged unsuccessful by participants when knowledge is not acquired.

Proposition #7. If the structure of inservice training is characterized by formal relationships and public access; with the subject matter arranged by solutions; with the focus on managing others; and delivery processes from experts to learners, then the inservice training is judged somewhat successful by participants.

Proposition #8. If the structure of inservice training is characterized by formal relationships and private access; with the subject matter arranged by solutions and by problems or by problems; with the focus on self; and delivery processes from experts to learners and with participants, then the inservice training is judged moderately successful by participants.

Proposition #9. If the structure of inservice training is characterized by informal relationships and public access; with the subject matter arranged by problems; with the focus on self; and delivery processes with participants, then the inservice training is judged highly successful by participants.

Proposition #10. If the structure of inservice training is characterized by informal relationships and private access; with the subject matter arranged by problems; with the focus on self; and delivery processes with participants, then the inservice training is judged highly successful by participants.

Demographic Characteristics of Inservice Training

Definition #9. Demographic characteristics of inservice training are the location of school and administrative experience of participants.

Proposition #11. The location of schools is either metropolitan or rural.

Proposition #11.1 If the structure is characterized by formal relationships, then administrators from schools in metropolitan and rural areas are present.

Proposition #11.2. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships, then administrators from metropolitan schools are present.

Proposition #11.3. If the structure is characterized by public access, then administrators from metropolitan and rural schools are present.

Proposition #11.4. If the structure is characterized by private access, then administrators from schools in metropolitan and rural schools are present.

Proposition #11.5. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships and public access, then administrators from metropolitan and rural schools are present.

Proposition #11.6. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships and private access, then administrators from

metropolitan and rural schools are present.

Proposition #11.7. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships and public access, then administrators from metropolitan schools are present.

Proposition #11.8. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships and private access, then administrators from metropolitan schools are present.

Proposition #11.9. The administrative experience of participants is the number of years of administrative experience in schools.

Definition #11. Administrators are inexperienced when they have five or less years of administrative experience.

Proposition #11.10. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships, then inexperienced and experienced administrators are present.

Definition #12. Administrators are experienced when they have six or more years of administrative experience.

Proposition #11.11. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships, then inexperienced and experienced administrators are present.

Proposition #11.12. If the structure is characterized by public access, then inexperienced and experienced administrators are present.

Proposition #11.13. If the structure is characterized by

private access, then inexperienced and experienced administrators are present.

Proposition #11.14. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships and public access, then inexperienced administrators are present.

Proposition #11.15. If the structure is characterized by formal relationships and private access, then inexperienced and experienced administrators are present.

Proposition #11.16. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships and public access, then inexperienced and experienced administrators are present.

Proposition #11.17. If the structure is characterized by informal relationships and private access, then experienced administrators are present.

Practical Conclusions and Implications for Practice

The outline of a grounded theory for educational administrative inservice training developed in this study suggests that the majority of inservice training for school administrators occurs in structures with private access. Informal relationships present the best type of structure for high success. Through informal rather than formal channels, participants with problems find other individuals with solutions. The study further suggests that structures with private access

are utilized more often than structures with public access for inservice training by experienced school administrators. The greater the experience of administrators, the greater tendency to capitalize on informal relationships in structures with private access. Men and women high school principals participate in similar inservice training opportunities. The most significant demographic characteristics of educational administrative inservice training is the location of schools. School executives in suburban and urban areas participate in more inservice training activities than those from rural schools. The rural school administrator takes advantage of fewer inservice training activities and participates mostly in formal meetings.

Inservice training for educational administrators as suggested in this study takes advantage of the experience of participants. Mostly through tradition, participants know what works. At formal conferences, swap shops and gold mining sessions where participants exchange ideas are mirrors of practice in private informal structures. A metaphor of trading posts for exchanging problems and solutions also suggests that singular, universal solutions for problems associated with job performance may be shortsighted.

Among the practical implications resulting from this study for educational administrative inservice training include incorporation of structures characterized by informal

relationships and private access when subject matter focuses on self-improvement. Furthermore, opportunities for problems to be the loci of inservice training activities may enable solutions that are individual and problem specific to evolve. Networking arrangements among school administrators may be a useful method of promoting inservice training structures of private access and informal relationships. Inservice training opportunities are needed for rural school principals, but need not be limited to formal structures.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further research in educational administrative inservice training could occur which would both broaden and deepen the study. The study could be broadened by including more informants. The sample could be extended to other educational administrators, such as superintendents. Survey instruments for specific categories of structure administered to a stratified sample also could provide generalizability to the sample. Also, the study could be broadened by including other professionals, such as private sector managers in the sample. Broadening the study would provide greater generalizability to the study.

The study may be deepened by focusing on specific categories of structure and studying a particular structure in depth. By

using observational and interview techniques, greater insight into the details of specific categories could be gained.

REFERENCES

Allen, C., Pellicer, L., & Boardman, G. (1984). Model for administrator training, development uses both theory and practice. NASSP bulletin, 68(468), 14- 19.

Barth, R. (1984). The professional development of principals. Educational leadership, 42(2), 93-94. Becker, Howard S. (1952). Social-class variations in teacher-pupil relationships. Journal of educational sociology, 25, 451-465.

Becker, H. (1952) Social class variations in teacher pupil relationships. Journal of educational sociology, 25, 451-465.

Biles, C. (1979). Determining the effectiveness of administrator inservice. Thrust for educational leadership. 8(4), 19-21

Burello, T. & Orbaugh, T. (1982). Reducing the discrepancy between known and the unknown in inservice education. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 385-388.

Caldwell, B. (1979, June). A competency-based approach to administrator assessment and inservice, Paper presented at the International Congress on Education. Vancouver, BC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 180 079).

Daft, R. (1983). Organization theory and design. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.

Daresh, J. and LaPlant, J. (1985). Developing a research agenda for administrator inservice. Journal of research and development in education, 18(2), 39-43.

Daresh, J. (1987). Principals' perception of the quality of alternative inservice education models. Planning and changing, 18(1), 38-44.

DeLacy, J. & Rogel, J. (1981). A professional development program for administrators. Journal of staff development, 2(1), 116-40.

DeMont, R. & Hughes, L. (1984). Assessment center technology: Implications for administrator training programs. Planning and changing, 15(4), 219-25.

Donaldson, G. (1982). Rx for school leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 400-01.

Douglas, J. (1976). Investigative social research: Individual and team field research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Eggen, P. Kauchak, D. & Harder, R. (1979). Strategies for teachers. Englewood Clifts, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Erlandson, D., Henejosa, P., & McDonald, J. (1986). Wildflower or weed: The principals' center in Texas. Reflections. Cambridge, MA: The Principals' Center, Harvard University, Graduate School, 73-77.

Garberina, M. (1980, December). Rites of passage in role socialization among novice principals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association. Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 208 459).

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine Publishing Company.

Gmelch, W., Rose, L., & Erickson, K. (1976). Rx for professional growth: Inservice education. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 117 817).

Higley, J. (1974). Inservice training for staff and administrators. School Leadership Digest Service, No. 8. Washington, D.C., National Association of Elementary School Principals; Eugene, OR: Oregon State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 099 951).

Hersey, P. (1982). The NASSP assessment center develops leadership talent. Educational leadership. 39(5), 370-71.

Huddle, E. (1982). A Maryland program for the professional development of school principals. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 402.

Iannaconne, L. (1964). An Approach to the informal organization of the schools. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration: The sixty-third yearbook of the national society for the study of education, part II. Chicago, IL: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Jackson, P. (1986). The practice of teaching. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kipp, W., Thayer, A., & Olivera, J. (1985). Project Leadership: Introductory component. Sacramento, CA: Association of California School Administrators.

Lambert, L. (1986). A study in professionalism: The principals' center in Marin county. Reflections, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Principals' Center, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, 15-24.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lutz, F. & Iannaccone, L. (1969). Understanding educational organizations: A field study approach. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Lutz, F. & Ferrante, R. (1972). Emergent practices in continuing education of school administrators. (Contract No. OEC 0-8-080353-3514). Eugene, OR: University of Oregon. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 069 015).

March, J. & Olsen. J. (1976). Ambiguity and choice in organizations. Oslo, Norway: Harald Lyche & Company.

March, J. & Simon, H. (1958). Organizations. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Miles, W., & Biggs, W. (1979). Common, recurring, and avoidable errors in management development. Training and development journal, 33(2), 32-35.

Nudson, H. & DeVries, R. (1979). Meeting the urban principals' needs, Thrust for educational leadership. 8(4), 22-24.

Olivas, L. (1980). Using assessment centers for individual and organizational development. Personnel, 57(3), 63-67.

Olivero, J. (1982). Principals and their inservice needs. Educational leadership, 39(5), 340-344.

Olivero, J. & Armistead, L. (1981) Schools and their leaders -- some realities about principals and their inservice needs. NASSP bulletin, 65(455) 134-132.

Orlich, D. (1985, December). A paradigm for staff development planning. Paper presented at the National Staff Development Council Annual Conference, Denver, CO.

Perrow, C. (1965). Hospitals, technology, structure and goals. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago, IL: Rand McNalley & Co.

Pitner, N. (1982). Training of the school administrator: state of the art. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, Division of Educational Policy and Management, College of Education, University of Oregon.

Pitner, N. (1987). Principles of quality staff development lessons for administrator training. Approaches to administrative training in education. Ed. J. Murphy and P. Hallinger. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sange, P. (1982). Leadership training for secondary principals and department heads. Educational leadership, 40(1), 55.

Schatzman, L. & Strauss, A. (1973). Field Research: Strategies for a national sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Schmitt, N., Merritt R., Fitzgerald, M., & Nol, R. (1982). The NASSP assessment center: A validity report. NASSP bulletin, 66(455), 134-132.

Scott, W. (1981). Organizations: Rational, natural and open systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Scott-McDonald, K. & Howe, B. (1986). National directory of principals' centers. Cambridge, MA: The Principals' Center, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education.

Silver, P. & Moyle, C. (1984). The impact of intensive inservice programs on educational leaders and their organizations. Planning and changing, 15, 18-32.

Simon, H. (1957). Administrative behavior. New York, NY: Macmillan and Company.

Somerville, J. (1982). Ongoing inservice for principals: A practical approach and challenge. Planning and changing, 13(1), 59-64.

Stanton, M. (1980). Issues in the professional development of secondary school principals. Journal of educational administration, 18(2), 213-23.

Wise, J. (1981). Staff development for administrators -- an administrative academy. Journal of Staff Development, 2(1), 70-77.